

## BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2

1

3 4

5

6

7

10 11

12

13

15

14

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Arizona Corporation Commission COMMISSIONERS

DOCKETED

AUG 2 9 2014

2014 AUG 29 P 3: 46

DOCKETED BY

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA TELEPHONE COMPANY, AN

ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A

HEARING TO DETERMINE THE EARNINGS OF THE COMPANY, THE FAIR VALUE OF

THE COMPANY FOR RATEMAKING

PURPOSES, AND TO INCREASE RESIDENTIAL RATES AS NECESSARY TO

COMPENSATE FOR THE RATE IMPACTS

OF THE FCC'S USF/ICC TRANSFORMATION ORDER.

**BOB STUMP - CHAIRMAN** 

SUSAN BITTER SMITH

**GARY PIERCE** 

**BOB BURNS** 

**BRENDA BURNS** 

DOCKET NO. T-02063A-13-0411

STAFF'S RESPONSE TO AUGUST 7, 2014 PROCEDURAL ORDER

ORIGINAL

On July 1, 2014, the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") issued a procedural order which asked Staff and Arizona Telephone Company ("Arizona Telephone") to file updated recommendations based upon the FCC's June 10, 2014, Order which established a phase-in of the residential rate floor and a delay in implementing the phased-in rates. Staff filed its procedural recommendations on July 31, 2014.

Staff recommended, in part, that the Company file updated schedules reflecting the changes resulting from the FCC's June 10, 2014 Order. On August 7, 2014, the ALJ issued another procedural order requiring Arizona Telephone to file revised schedules showing "the pro forma effects on revenues if residential access rates are increased to \$16, \$18 and \$20, and to also show the effect on operations if residential rates remain at \$14/month and the federal benchmark is \$16, \$18, and \$20/month; and...[to] update the exhibit that shows a typical residential rate at the requested rates." Arizona Telephone filed its updated schedules as required by the Procedural Order on August 22, 2014.

Procedural Order at p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Procedural Order at p. 2.

See T-01923A-13-0428

<sup>3</sup> See, T-01923A-13-0428 (South Central Utah Telephone Assoc., Inc.) Tr. at p. 49.

See, Staff's July 31, 2014 Response to July 1, 2014 Procedural Order. \$18, or the 2016 rate floor set by the FCC, whichever is lower.

6 \$20, or the 2016 rate floor set by the FCC, whichever is lower.

<sup>7</sup> The increase in revenues is a cumulative number.

The August 7, 2014, Procedural Order also required Staff to state why it believes that the revised phased-in rates are just, fair and reasonable. Specifically the Order stated:

Staff...provided its reasons for believing that its recommended rates (i.e. up to \$19.00) are just, fair and reasonable, and necessary. In its July 31, 2014 update, Staff recommends adopting the lower of \$16, \$18 and \$20 or the FCC's benchmark floor to be phased-in over time. Given these revised recommendations, Staff is requested to clarify its reasons for concluding that the revised rates and phase-in schedule are just, fair and reasonable.<sup>2</sup>

Staff has revised its recommendations consistent with the FCC's most recent Order which came out subsequent to the hearing in this matter. Additionally, Staff originally supported a rate increase up to \$19.00 because that is the amount that had been noticed to customers, unless the ALJ or Commission believed the higher rate of \$20.46 was appropriate.<sup>3</sup> Staff continues to take the position that this matter has been adequately noticed for a rate up to \$19.00 by the Company. For this reason, Staff is recommending that within 30 days of the effective date of any Order addressing these issues, the Company should be required to re-notice cutomers informing them of the new rate floor of \$20.00 to be implemented in 2017 and the preceding step increases and their effective dates.<sup>4</sup>

Staff has reviewed the revised schedules filed by Arizona Telephone. The revised schedules show the following impact on the rate of return at the current local service rate and at the phased-in rates provided in the FCC's Order.

	Current Rate	Phased-In Rate as of December 1, 2014	Phased-In Rate as of June 1, 2016	Phased-In Rate as of June 1, 2017
	\$ 14.00	\$16.00	\$18.00 <sup>5</sup>	$$20.00^{6}$
ROR	-18.90%	-17.80%	-16.70%	-15.60%
Change in ROR		1.10	2.20	3.30
Change in Revenues		\$15,682	\$82,224	\$123,336 <sup>7</sup>

If the Company does not adjust its local service rates to the FCC rate floors on the dates indicated, it will lose federal universal service support on a dollar for dollar basis. No increase in the local service rate would reduce the federal universal service support provided to the Company and would therefore lower the Company's rate of return. With no local service increase to the level of the FCC's phasedin rates, the Company schedules indicate that it would experience the following decreases to its federal universal service support levels; December 2014 - \$41,112; June 2016 - \$82,224 and June 2017 - \$118,182. This equates to the following reduced rates of return on December 1, 2014, June 1, 2016 and June 1, 2017 respectively: -20%; -21% and -22%.

Based upon the above information, Staff believes that the phased-in rate increases are fair, just and reasonable. Staff respectfully requests that the ALJ find that Arizona Telephone's revised schedules demonstrate that the new rates are fair, just and reasonable, and that the ALJ adopt Staff's additional recommendations contained in its July 31, 2014 Response to the July 1, 2014 Procedural Order.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 29th day of August, 2014.

Charles H. Hains, Attorney

17

Maureen Scott, Senior Staff Counsel

18

Attorneys, Legal Division

19

Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street

20

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

(602) 542-3402

23

24 Original and thirteen (13) copies of

the foregoing filed this 29<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2014, with:

26

27

25

Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007 28

l	
1	Copy of the foregoing emailed/mailed
2	this 29 <sup>th</sup> day of August, 2014, to:
3	Craig A. Marks, Esq. Craig A. Marks, P.L.C.
4	10645 North Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676 Phoenix, Arizona 85028
5	Craig.Marks@azbar.org Attorney for Arizona Telephone Company
6	
7	Kaup Mustin
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	